

Confirm. No. 8643
450100-04891**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of this application and consideration and entry of this paper are respectfully requested in view of the herein remarks, which place the application in condition for allowance.

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

The applicants wish to extend their thanks to the Examiner for speaking with the applicants' representative, Howard C. Lee, on 2 November 2005 to discuss methods of advancing prosecution in this application.

With the entry of the amendments, claims 1, 6-12, 14, 16-18 and 22 would be pending. Entry of the claims would be consistent with the scope of the claims agreed to be allowable during the telephone interview between the applicants' representative and the Examiner on 2 November 2005. Even if the proposed claims did not place the claims in condition for allowance, they should still be entered as the amendments would greatly simplify the issues for appeal (i.e. Claims 1 and 12 as amended are essentially claims 19 and 21, respectively, which were first presented in the applicants' response of 5 August 2005). No new matter has been added by this amendment.

With regard to the Examiner's question during the telephone interview regarding the example cited on page 35-38 of the specification, the undersigned representative confirmed with the applicants' representative for assignee that the example is encompassed by the claims as amended.

It is submitted that the claims, herewith and as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited in the Office Action, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The amendments of the claims, as presented herein, are not made for purposes of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§§§ 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these amendments and additions are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. 103 REJECTIONS HAVE BEEN OVERCOME

Claims 1-22 were rejected as allegedly being obvious over Ichimura et al. (U.S. Patent 6,456,416 - "Ichimura").

Confirm. No. 8643
450100-04891

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested. see MPEP 2143.03. Although the applicants disagree that Ichimura taught each and every element of the previous claims 1 and 12 as presented in their response of 5 August 2005, in order to advance prosecution, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to read upon the subject matter of old claim 19 which was agreed to be allowable during the telephone interview of 2 November 2005. The applicants reserve the right to further prosecute the previously filed claims in a continuation or divisional application.

As requested by the Examiner, the applicants verify that the example cited on pages 35-39 is encompassed by the scope of the claims as amended above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks and amendments herewith, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The undersigned looks forward to hearing favorably from the Examiner at an early date, and, the Examiner is invited to telephonically contact the undersigned to advance prosecution. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee occasioned by this paper, or credit any overpayment of such fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

William S. Frommer Howard C. Lee
Reg. No. 25,506 Reg. No. 48,104

Tel. (212) 588-0800

BEST AVAILABLE COPY